

INDIANA SECURED SCHOOL SAFETY BOARD MEETING

Indiana Government Center - South

Conference Room 18

9:00 a.m.

302 W. Washington Street

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

10-23-2013

Members present:

Allen, Mary (CJI)

Bowlen, Eric (Martinsville)

Hill, John (IDHS)

Reske, Scott (DOE)

Zoeller, Greg (ATG Office)

Members absent:

Carter, Doug (ISP)

Eslinger, Mike (Parke County)

Proxy:

Bilkey, Matt (ISP)

Staff:

Davis, Bridget (IDHS)

Elsner, Andrew (IDHS)

Goris, Dan (IDHS)

Hogue, Dr. Richard (ISP)

Hopkins, Larry (ATG Office)

Karns, Allison (IDHS)

Snyder, Mara (IDHS)

Stewart, Kimberly (IDHS)

Woodall, Rachel (IDHS)

Workman, James (LT. Gov. Office)

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Director Hill who welcomed everyone. It was determined that there was a quorum. Staff introductions were made. No members of the public attended the meeting.

The minutes from the September 16, 2013 meeting were reviewed and approved.

- Director Hill did an overview of the handouts and thanked the members of the subcommittee: Richard Hogue, McDowell, Rachel Woodall, Kimberly Stewart, Andrew Elsner, Dan Goris, Dave Woodward and four people from CJI.
- The Three Phase Format handouts are the recommendations that the Board could agree with them or not. The schools in green are to receive full funding. Schools in yellow, to receive partial funding due to all of the requirements not being satisfied or their requests were outside the scope of statute. Schools shown in red were recommended not to be approved.
- The Summary Information Sheet showed the overhead, budgetary recession and how many grants were approved. The three different types of submitted requests were for school resource officers, threat assessment and school safety equipment.
- The Rural Schools Versus Urban Schools were shown in two ways on the handout: Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), in which census data was depicted one way to show rural versus urban. The Purdue version showed urban, rural and mixed school designations.
- The Resource Landscape Map provided a series of numbers showing how schools were funded and how many using grant funds. An additional landscape map was a Geographical Information System (GIS) map of charter school districts and the amount of funding throughout the state.
- Most of the applications that were denied were requests outside of the parameters of the grant. These requests did not justify how utilization of the grant funds aligned with the purposes of the grant. A few entities were unable to demonstrate the matching funds. Some applications did not meet the minimum quality or did not have a school safety specialist employed (required for school corporations). The grants which were denied were not well rounded proposals for meeting the justifications of the grant.
- Matching funds must be shown in the entity's submitted budget and will also be verified again when they submit for reimbursement for the expenses they have made.
- Members of the subcommittee presented a series of 11 seminars across the state, at which time it was stressed that the School Safety Grant is not a standalone program but must work with all of their other school safety programs and also with their school safety specialist. The seminars stressed the necessity of a complete application and making sure

all of their components were working together and show the impact the grant dollars would have on their student body.

- Applicants were told they could not use the School Safety Grant to pay for an existing SRO's regular hours, but could pay for new days added to the SRO's work week. The grant money may not be used to supplant existing funds. The funds are for new SROs or projects only.
- Some preliminary plans have been made for helping the grant quality for next year.
- Dr. Hogue stated that extraordinary steps were taken in order to award as much grant money as possible in a consistent and orderly manner.
- CJI currently funds SRO programs and will be evaluating/reviewing applications taking into consideration that SROs have now been statutorily defined.
- Some of the requested grant applications received reduced funding due to the quality of the grant application.
- Some of the suggested match amounts did not demonstrate an acceptable match amount or ability to meet the match requirement and received a reduced amount.
- Some of the grant requests lacked detail but had enough justification and measurable outcomes to award some grant money.
- Percentages and numbers: there were 290 eligible entities, 234 submitted, 81% applied and 95% of the grant applications were approved. Every effort was made to approve any grant application if at all possible. 28% of charter schools applied, 62% were charter schools recommended for funding and 81 % of traditional school corporations applied. Turn-around academies are schools that have been taken over by the state and are operated by a partner. There are five-turn around academies, five of them submitted and 40 % were recommended for funding. Other schools that were eligible; Indiana School for the Deaf, Indiana School for the Blind, Burris Lab School and Indiana Academy for Science, Math and Humanity located at Ball State. Just one applied and was funded.
- 116 SROs were funded. 18 threat assessments were funded. 196 involving equipment of grants were funded.
- Mr. Bowlen abstained from voting on the grant application from Martinsville.
- A motion was made and carried to fund the grants recommended by the subcommittee.
Discussion of when the next cycle would be: opening mid January
 - Another round of money that is available for the next state fiscal year beginning July 1, 2014. Schools can begin applying in January, 2014 for about 60 days. The review committee will have time to review and have the money out to the schools by July 1, 2014.
 - Schools are considering school buses as their next priority in need of more security.
 - There are approximately one million students in the State of Indiana. 77% of the students in Indiana will be affected by the nearly nine million dollars awarded for School Safety Grants.

Entities which applied and did not receive funding will be sent a letter that they were not approved and they will be reminded of the new cycle of grants. They will also be told about the seminars and webinars to help them be successful the next time they submit.

Please let Director Hill know if you have any suggestions or comments.

Adjournment:

Chairman Hill adjourned the meeting at 9:57 a.m.

Next Meeting Time and Location:

TBD